

REMARKS

A. Front Page of Office Action

The cover page of the June 5, 2002 office action indicates that claims 1-20 are pending in the application and claims 1-20 are rejected.

The applicants agrees that the front page summary of the office action reflects the contents of the office action.

B. Summary and Response to Items Enumerated in the Office Action

In page 9 lines 3-14 the examiner reminds the applicant of proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure, and requires appropriate correction.

In reply, the applicant respectfully submits a substitute abstract enclosed herewith the present amendment. Substitution of the abstract is respectfully requested.

On page 2 line 16 through page 4 line 9, the examiner further rejects claims 1-20 as being anticipated by Plantz et al. (US No. 6,088,702 hereinafter Plantz). In support of the rejections, the examiner states that:

Plantz teaches to a method and system for permitting coordinated publishing, assembly and administration of texts by an unlimited number of authors or editors, comprising:

As per **claims 1, 11 and 20**,

receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript comprising at least one of text data, audio data, and video data (column 7, lines 37-43, 58-63; column 8, lines 20-27; column 9, lines 24-31);

assigning a unique identification to said manuscript data (column 8, lines 59-67);

prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript (column 8, lines 20-30);

storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer (column 8, lines 20-30, 59-67; column 10, lines 1-13).

As per **claims 2-3 and 12-13**,

depending upon stored agreement data from at least one potential reviewer, transmitting a signal prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript (column 8, lines 59-67).

As per **claims 4-5 and 14-15**,

storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor for said manuscript in

association with said manuscript data (column 10, lines 8-36);

storing at least one date on which said associate editor assigns a potential reviewer (column 10, lines 12-14).

As per **claims 6 and 16**,

storing dates on which at least one of receiving said manuscript, prompting a potential reviewer, and receiving agreement data occur (column 10, lines 12-14, 46-62).

As per **claims 7-8 and 17-18**,

authorizing transmission of said manuscript to at least one of associate editors, potential reviewers and reviewers of said manuscript (column 10, lines 46-62).

As per **claims 9-10 and 19**,

said authorization comprises storing, in association with said unique identification assigned to said manuscript, an identification of an associate editor and a reviewer (column 10, lines 30-62).

With respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 20, the applicant respectfully submits that

Plantz does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of a computer implemented process

“storing a decision whether to publish”, and combinations thereof as claimed in claims 1, 11 and

20. To the contrary, Plantz merely discloses a method that “facilitate and expedite the process of book and text editing, wherein more than one author and more than one editor participate and contribute.” See column 5, lines 14-17. That is, **Plantz allows collaboration** between and among individuals and facilitates a jointly authored and edited project **after the project publication decision has been made.**

Further **the present application discloses a computer implemented process used to make a publication decision** on a manuscript. The computer implemented process is implemented by a networking environment coupled with a set of information tracking, decision correlating, and storing operations. As a result, a final publication approval or denial decision can be reached. The present application discloses that one or more reviewers and the author of the manuscript can efficiently review the decision and related information on line.

Particularly, Plantz discloses a method that allows “essentially simultaneous viewing of an entire in-process document, which easily can be downloaded for publication in a variety of

formats" (see column 5 lines 19-21). In other words, **Plantz emphasizes editing text and conforming the publication into a particular format** ready for publication. The present invention, however, focuses on a reviewing and decision-making process of whether to publish a manuscript based on a particular set of criteria. In **the present invention, the manuscript is reviewed whereas Plantz teaches editing.**

Moreover, a **final decision tallying mechanism is provided** in the present invention to make the final publication approval or denial decision, as claimed in newly added claim 24. Needless to say, there is no disclosure or similar provision of a majority tallying decision making in Plantz because Plantz is directed to achieve a different goal in the publishing business than the present invention. As a consequence, Plantz does not disclose or subject the steps of "prompting", "storing", and "making" defined by claim 1 and the other independent claims, and Plantz does not disclose all features relating to the decision and review process defined by the dependent claims.

The examiner states prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and communication information in the conclusion. In reply, applicant notes this.



31518

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date

8/30/02

Respectively Submitted,

Richard A. Neffeld, Ph.D.

Registration No. 35,299

Ruay Lian Ho

Registration No. 48,110

Printed: August 29, 2002 (2:40pm)

Y:\Clients\Joel Plotkin\JOEL0001\Drafts\FirstAmendment_020802.wpd